



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,531	09/23/2003	Eric Bright	BV-3905/BV-4032D	2136
7590	07/26/2005		EXAMINER	
Saint-Gobain Corporation 1 New Bond Street Box 15138 Worcester, MA 01615-0138			SHAKERI, HADI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

48

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,531	BRIGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hadi Shakeri	3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 38,50-67 and 69-93 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38,50-67 and 69 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 70-83 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 84-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 38, 50-66 and 69 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 110904. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 84-93 (as best understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Prior art as admitted by the Applicant, e.g., pages 1-7 meets all the limitations, since product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the process steps, only the structure implied by the steps, thus sintered agglomerates of abrasive grain produced by the method of prior art, as admitted by the applicant, (e.g., US 4,799,939, US 4,541,842 in view of different types of abrasive grains or fillers; bond materials; average size and porosity) would meet all the structural limitations, i.e., sintered agglomerated grains of certain size, material and Porosity. (See MPEP 2113 [R-1]).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent

Art Unit: 3723

possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 84-93 (as best understood) are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,797,023. The claims for the above US Patent, recite an abrasive comprising agglomerate grains made by the method as recited except for the packing density (as best understood), however, the density recited would depend on size and type of grains used, both modifications (with respect to size and/or type of material) well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, depending on the workpiece and/or operational parameters.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 70-83 are allowed.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Prior art does not disclose or suggest a method of producing agglomerates of abrasive grains including the steps as recited.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 050905 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument regarding the rejection of the product-by-process, i.e., "sintered agglomerates of abrasive grains", claims 83-93 that have three dimensional shape, loose packing density and certain porosity is not persuasive. Three dimensional sintered agglomerates made with particular interconnected porosity are known in the art, what is different is the method of forming them, which does not further limit the grains being claimed. Putting the grains together to have a certain "loose packing density" does not patentably further limit the sintered agglomerates of abrasive grains, neither does the argument that prior art uses slurry method or does not use rotary calciner to agglomerate loose grains.

The argument regarding the Double Patenting rejection, that claims 70-83 were part of a set of withdrawn, non-elected claims following a restriction requirement in the parent application is not persuasive. 35 USC Section 121 and MPEP Rule 804.01 prohibit application of double

patenting rejection of a divisional Application over the parent. In this case Double Patenting was over US Patent 6,797,023 granted on the Application filed on May 14, 2002, serial number 10/145,367. The parent Application of the instant case is serial number 10/120,969 matured to US Patent No. 6,679,758 not related to US 6,797,023 over which double patenting was applied.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hadi Shakeri whose telephone number is 571-272-4495. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Hadi Shakeri
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3723
July 22, 2005